

Application No. 10/522503
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 20040186189 (Muller). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The instant process basically describes the use of a jigger for treating film (see claim 20). Jiggers are known from dyeing textiles but have not been described for use in treating polymer films for inducing materials which cause proton conductivity.

According to the Examiner, Muller renders the instant invention obvious. However, the applicant could not find a process suggested in the reference which renders obvious the applicant's claimed process. One feature that the Examiner said was not taught by Muller was wherein the film being unrolled from a spool and rolled up on a further spool (see claim 1). The Examiner asserted that this is well known in the art and refers to US 1,375,815 which is entitled "Autographic Camera". This reference has nothing to do with the applicant's claimed invention or the invention of Muller. However, if this was as well known in the art, Muller would have done this in his process. Muller does not suggest doing this step.

However, another feature that is not disclosed in Muller is wherein the direction of travel of the film is changed during the treatment by altering the direction of rotation of the spools. The Examiner has asserted that the process of a film in the interim of rewinding is well documented and cited US 5,965,485 which is entitled "Image-transfer ink ribbon, image-transferred member and method for producing the image-transferred member". Again, this has nothing to do with the applicant's claimed invention or the invention of Muller. Muller does not suggest this feature. The Examiner's argument is based on hindsight reconstruction. For this reason alone the rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/522503
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

Claim 20

In the preferred case a polyazole polymer film is fed into a Jigger. The bath of the Jigger instead of a dye contains a liquid which can act for different purposes:

- a) if the liquid is water, the process can be used for the washing of polyazole polymer film to remove/wash out residual solvents (such as DMAc) from polymer film casting and/or
- b) if the bath is an acid (e.g. phosphoric acid) a polyazole polymer film can be imbibed with acid to obtain proton conductivity. By replacing water with acid or by use of aqueous acid a combination of a) and b) can be established or
- c) the bath in the liquid can be monomers of vinylacids which swell/soak the polymer film and later on the soaked vinyl monomers being polymerized.

Attached in Appendix 1 is a publication of an English technical lexicon explaining the use of Jiggers. This information is contained on the following web cite:

http://www.drapilux.com/english/different_experience/drapilux_lexicon.php.

As explained above, Muller is remote to the instant invention. For the above reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn. In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

MAR. 3. 2006 4:55PM

NO. 0461 P. 7/28

Application No. 10/522503
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005

Docket No.: 12834-00004-US

A two month extension fee has been paid. Applicant believes no additional fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 12834-00004-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ashley I. Pezzner

Registration No.: 35,646
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant